

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to specify that the “color reproducibility of transmissive region chromaticity is 60% or more.” This amendment is supported by Examples 1-7 as summarized in Tables 2-8. These Examples show a color reproducibility of transmissive region chromaticity of 60% or more as claimed.

In addition, new dependent claims 17-20 have been added. New claims 17 and 18 specify that the x value of the transmissive region chromaticity of the red picture elements is from 0.618 to 0.634. New claims 19 and 20 specify that the y value of the transmissive region chromaticity of the green picture elements is from 0.574 to 0.617. These dependent claims are also supported by Examples 1-7 as summarized in Tables 2-8.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagi in view of Chang and Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously explained, claims 1 and 3 claim transfective liquid crystal displays that include 1) a color filter having a transmissive region and a reflective region which are provided in each picture element of the color filter and which have colored layers comprising a single material, 2) a three-peak type LED backlight source being used as the backlight source, 3) and an aperture that is formed in the reflective region. Further, applicants have disclosed liquid displays that have unexpected superior properties than displays using any one or any two of these elements. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to simply combine references that each include only one or two of the claimed elements.

In response, the Examiner has stated that the unexpected results coincides with the results in Chang column 7, lines 41-67 and column 8, lines 1-18. As stated above, claims 1 and 3 have been amended to specify that the “color reproducibility of transmissive region chromaticity is 60% or more.” Chang fails to disclose or suggest a display capable of achieving this level of color reproducibility. More specifically, the color reproducibility in Chang can be determined from

Figure 5. Attached is a marked up copy of Figure 5 from Chang. In Figure 5, the color reproducibility is represented by the square of the area of triangle 81. The marked up Figure also includes a triangle representing Example 1 from applicants' disclosure. As can be seen, the triangle representing Example 1 is much larger than the triangle representing Chang's display. Since Example 1 had a color reproducibility of 60%, Chang's display must necessarily have a color reproducibility of less than 60%. Accordingly, Chang does not disclose or suggest a display with the claimed color reproducibility. Further, neither Nakagi nor Kim disclose or suggest a display with this characteristic.

As described on page 9, lines 12-14, of the specification the present invention provides "a transmissive display having high color reproducibility and a reflective display having excellent characteristics (color reproducibility and brightness)." In comparison, page 8, lines 17-21 explains that in the prior art "when the color reproducibility is increased in the transmissive display and the reflective display, the brightness of the reflective display is decreased to cause the insufficient performance as a liquid crystal display." Consequently, the claimed invention provides excellent characteristics (color reproducibility and brightness) of a transmissive display even at the high color reproducibility of a reflective display. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest how to achieve the claimed high color reproducibility (60% or more) of a transmissive display, while maintaining the high color reproducibility and brightness of a reflective display as claimed.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 and 3 should be withdrawn. Applicants solicit an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **360842011300**.

Dated: June 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7769